

REMARKS

In the **non-final** Office Action mailed July 22, 2011, the Office noted that claims 21-41 were pending and rejected claims 21-41. In this amendment claims 21-23, 27, 29 and 36-41 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing, claims 21-41 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to. In particular, the Office asserts that the figure numbering is not oriented in the middle of the each drawing sheet. The Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the rejection. The Applicants submit here replacement drawings with the Figure numbers properly oriented.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants have amended the claim to overcome the rejection. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21, 23, 24, 27-30, 32, 36, 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Duron, U.S. Patent No. 7,339,481 in view of Fischer, U.S. Patent No. 7,151,436. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Duron has a filing date of November 30, 2004. The instant Application claims benefit of priority to JP2004-054933 filed February 27, 2004 and JP2004-304876 filed October 19, 2004, verified English translation of which are submitted herein to prefect priority. The Applicants submit that features of the present claims are believed to be taught in JP2004-054933 filed February 27, 2004 and JP2004-304876 filed October 19, 2004. As the instant Application has perfected priority to a date prior to the filing date of Duron, Duron fails to be prior art.

Therefore, the Office has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicants have amended claim 21. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in FIGs. 2, 3, 4, and 5, and ¶¶ [0007]-[0010], [0022]-[0025], and [0031]-[0048] of the Specification.

Applicants have amended claim 23. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 4 and in ¶¶ [0037]-[0040].

Applicants have amended claim 27. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 4 and in ¶¶ [0031].

Applicants have amended claim 29. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 4 and in ¶¶ [0048].

Applicants have amended claim 40. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Figs. 24-28 and in ¶¶ [0058]-[0060].

Applicants have amended claim 41. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Figs. 24-28.

The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of the claims. The features of the amended claims are not taught by the prior art.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Duron in view of Fischer in further view of Terakawa, U.S. Patent No. 3,761,934. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Claim 22 has been amended. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 3 and ¶¶ 0028 and 0031 of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of the claims.

The features of the amended claim are not taught by the prior art.

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Duron in view of Fischer in further view of Smith, U.S. Patent No. 6,236,314. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Duron, Fischer and Smith, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 25 and 26.

Claims 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Duron in view of Fischer in further view of Atkins, U.S. Patent No. 6,784,787. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Duron, Fischer and Atkins, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 33 and 34.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Duron in view of Fischer in further view of Dinger, U.S. Patent No. 4,537,515. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Duron, Fischer and Dinger, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 35.

Claims 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Duron in view of Fischer in

further view of Chieu, U.S. Patent No. 5,995,019. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Applicants have amended claim 29. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Figs. 14 and 15 and in ¶ [0040].

For at least the reasons discussed above, Duron, Fischer and Chieu, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 36 and 37.

Claims 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Duron in view of Fischer in further view of Bauer, U.S. Patent No. 7,084,769. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Applicants have amended claims 38 and 39. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in Figs. 14 and 15 and in ¶ [0040].

For at least the reasons discussed above, Duron, Fischer and Bauer, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 38 and 39.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103. It is also submitted

that claims 21-41 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./  
James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg. No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/lrs/dl

**APPENDIX:**

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- ☒ - Replacement Sheets for Figures 1-32 of the drawings
- ☒ - verified English translations of foreign priority documents  
JP2004-054933 and JP2004-304876